

**THE DESIGN OF TASKS IN “BAHASA INGGRIS FOR NINTH GRADE  
STUDENTS OF JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL” ENGLISH WORKBOOK  
IN CANDLIN’S PERSPECTIVE (1987)**



**Publication Article**

**Submitted as a Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements  
for Getting Bachelor Degree of Education in English Department**

**Proposed by:**

**INDAH SUSILASARI**

**A 320100167**

**DEPARTMENT OF TEACHER TRAINING AND EDUCATION  
MUHAMMADIYAH UNIVERSITY OF SURAKARTA**

**2014**



**UNIVERSITAS MUHAMMADIYAH SURAKARTA**  
**FAKULTAS KEGURUAN DAN ILMU PENDIDIKAN**

Jl. A. Yani Tromol Pos 1-Pabelan, Kartasura Tlp. (0271) 717417 Fax: 715448 Surakarta 57012

---

**Surat Persetujuan Artikel Ilmiah**

Yang bertanda tangan di bawah ini pembimbing Skripsi/Tugas Akhir:

Nama : Prof. Dr. Endang Fauziati, M.Hum

NIK : 274

Nama : Nur Hidayat, S.Pd

NIK : 771

Telah membaca dan mencermati naskah artikel publikasi ilmiah yang merupakan ringkasan Tesis dari mahasiswa:

Nama mahasiswa : Indah Susilasari

NIM : A 320100167

Jurusan : Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris

Judul Skripsi : **THE DESIGN OF TASKS IN "BAHASA INGGRIS FOR NINTH GRADE STUDENTS OF JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL" ENGLISH WORKBOOK IN CANDLIN'S PERSPECTIVE (1987)**

Naskah artikel tersebut, layak dan dapat disetujui untuk dipublikasikan.

Demikian persetujuan dibuat, semoga dapat dipergunakan seperlunya.

Surakarta, Februari 2014

Pembimbing I

Pembimbing II

  
Prof. Dr. Endang Fauziati, M.Hum

NIK. 274

  
Nur Hidayat, S.Pd

NIK. 77

**ACCEPTANCE**

**THE DESIGN OF TASK IN “BAHASA INGGRIS FOR NINTH GRADE  
STUDENTS OF JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL” ENGLISH WORKBOOK  
IN CANDLIN’S PERSPECTIVE (1987)**

**PUBLICATION ARTICLE**

**Written By:**

**Indah Susilasari**  
**A320100167**

**Accepted and Approved by Board of Examiner  
School of Teacher Training and Education  
Muhammadiyah University of Surakarta**

**Team of Examiners:**

1. **Prof. Dr. Endang Fauziati, M. Hum**  
(Consultant I)
2. **Nur Hidayat, S. Pd**  
(Consultant II)

()  
()

**Dean,**



  
**Prof. Dr. Harun Joko Prayitno, M. Hum**  
**NIP. 19680428199303001**

**THE DESIGN OF TASKS IN “BAHASA INGGRIS FOR NINTH GRADE  
STUDENTS OF JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL” ENGLISH WORKBOOK  
IN CANDLIN’S PERSPECTIVE (1987)**

*Indah Susilasari*

English Department, FKIP-UMS

Jl. A. Yani Pabelan Kartasura Tromol Pos 1 Surakarta 57102

Telp. (0271) 717417 Fax. (0271) 715448

**ABSTRACT**

*This article represents the design of tasks presented in an English workbook Bahasa Inggris viewed from the theory of characteristic of good task proposed by Candlin. The objectives of the research are to describe how the tasks provided in the book are designed on 8 criteria proposed by Candlin. The writer employs descriptive analysis. The data of the research are the tasks presented in the workbook Bahasa Inggris. The data source is “Bahasa Inggris” workbook, written by Teacher Association in Wonogiri Regency. Having analyzed the textbook, the researcher concludes that: the tasks designed based on 8 criteria proposed by Candlin are including tasks model such as word matching, completion, translation, oral production by using picture, storytelling, oral interview, constructing sentence, comprehension involving pairs and groups work, role play, constructing sentence, guessing, picture-sentence matching, sentence matching, reading aloud, dialog composition and jumbles task and by the percentage that is shown in research finding, the result of the percentage shows that 87,5 % task in the workbook appropriate with the criteria of good task suggested by Candlin. By using criterion of evaluation proposed by Nurgiyantoro, it can be concluded that the task provided in the workbook are categorized as very good task.*

*Keywords: Task Design, Task Model, Criteria of Good Task*

## **I. Introduction**

Task is an important thing which support English language teaching and learning process. For the teacher, tasks are media to measure how far the student understand about the materials, teacher can see student's understanding trough the students' outcomes after doing the task. For the learner, tasks are media where they can apply their understanding and knowledge after getting the material from the teacher. In teaching English, a task has important role that can involve four language skills, linguistics form, and also involve real work processes of language use. In the real situation, many teachers face problems when they find that the task provided in the workbook is not suitable with the learners' need and ability, the design of the task are not understandable and ineffective. In this condition, it is necessary to conduct a task analysis to evaluate the design of the task in order the teacher know are the tasks categorized as good task or not. These conditions motivate the researcher to conduct a research about the design of tasks in the workbook.

Task analysis in which the tasks the learners will ultimately have to perform in target language are determined and the communicative and linguistic demands of the tasks ascertained (Richard, 1995: 41). Task analysis is the analysis of how task is accomplished, including a detail description of manual and mental activities, tasks and elements durations, task frequency, task complexity, task allocation, environmental condition, necessary clothing and equipment, and any other unique factors involved in or required for one or more people to perform a given task .

To reach a good task, Ellis (2003) states that there are eight principles that can be used as guidance for designing task. The designer of the task should ensure an appropriate level of task difficulty; establish clear goals for each task-based lesson; and developing an appropriate orientation to performing the task in the students. Besides, he or she must ensure that students adopt an active role in task-based lesson and encourage students to take risk. Then, the designer of the task needs to ensure that the learners are primarily focused in meaning when they perform a task. The designer of task also needs to provide

opportunities for focusing on form. The design of the task should require learners to evaluate their performance and progress.

There are many elicitation techniques that can be used when writing a task. Heaton (1990) provides some examples of task models. Those task models are cloze procedure; multiple choice; completion; transformation; combining sentence; oral interview; constant alternatives; punctuation; constructing sentences; dictation; substitution; language games; comprehension; composition; translation; jumbles; matching; oral production by using picture; guessing and reading aloud.

In cloze procedure task, every *n*th word is deleted in a text (usually every fifth, sixth or seventh word), and students have to complete each gap in the text, using the most appropriate word. Multiple-choice task requires the students to select the correct answer from the given group of alternative. The initial part of each multiple choice item is known as the *stem*; the choices from which the students select their answer are referred to as *options/responses/alternatives*. One option is the answer, correct option or key, while the other options are *distractors*.

In the completion task, the students are expected to fill in the blank with a word or phrase. The task may require the students to fill the blank using the proper form of the cue given or using the appropriate word from the given words. Transformation task requires the learner to transform the given sentence into another type, like question, negative, etc., and the mood, tense, aspect and etc. Transformations task is extremely useful for testing ability to produce structures in the target language.

Sentence combining task requires the learner to combine the given sentences by using sentences connectors (so, and, but and etc) or by transforming one sentences into the appropriate form/ as instructed and combine with the other. Oral interview requires the students asking and answer some questions orally. The task can be conducted in two ways. First, the task can be conducted by the teacher and a learner. In this case, the teacher is the interviewer. Second, this task can be conducted by students in pairs. In

constant alternatives task, the learner is required to choose an answer from two or more alternatives that remain the same for a series of items. Statement will be provided in term true/ false, yes/ no or agree/disagree. Punctuation task requires the learners to separate clause, sentence etc by placing proper punctuation.

In constructing sentences tasks, the learner has to make use of the given word grammatical forms from such as relative principle, verbal principle, etc in the sentences. Dictation task requires the learner to write what he hears. In Substitution task the learner has to substitute a word of particular slot changing the cue/ by changing a word in another slot. Language games tasks expects the students to form words, sentences using crossword puzzle or riddle, picture connectives, etc.

Comprehension task requires the learner to read/ listen to the passage and answer the question given. The oral answer will provide an opportunity for the teacher to examine the pronunciation aspects of the language, the written answer will enable the teacher to take care of the spelling and other related aspects of orthography. Composition task expects the learners to write creatively. The learners are expected to develop a narration about the topic making use of the vocabulary and structures under their control.

In the translation task, the learner is expected to retain the meaning and express it in the mother tongue and vice versa. Translation may indicate the range of vocabulary that a learner possesses in the target language. In jumbles task, learners are provided with sections or parts of a complete text, but the wrong order. They have to read or hear each part and decide in which order they would be best. Matching items usually consists of two lists called “premises” and “responses”. The learner is expected to match each premise with one of the response/simple matching. In compound matching, it may to match each premise with two or more response.

Oral production task by using picture requires the students to say some sentences based on the pictures given. Guessing task provide the students with a set a set of information (word, phrase or sentence) related to a thing and then

asking the learners to guess the name of the thing which is suitable with the information given before. Reading aloud task requires the students to read a text loudly; it provides an opportunity for the teacher to examine the students' pronunciation aspects of the language.

Candlin (1897) in Nunan (1992: 47) suggests 20 criteria for analyzing tasks in work book, good task should: (1) promote attention to meaning, purpose, negotiation; (2) draw objectives from the communicative needs of learners; (3) encourage attention to relevant data; (4) allow for flexible approaches to the task, offering different routes, media, modes of participations, procedures; (5) allow for different solutions depending on skills and strategies drawn on by learners; (6) involve language use in the solving of the task; (7) allow for co-evaluation by learner and teacher of the task and of the performance of the task; (8) promote a critical awareness about data and the processes of language learning; (9) Involve learners' contribution, attitude and affects; (10) be challenging but not threatening, to promote risk taking; (11) require input from all learners in terms of knowledge, skill and participation; (12) define a problem to be worked by learner, centered on learner but guided by the teacher; (13) develop the learners' capacities to estimate consequences and repercussions on the task in question; (14) provide opportunities for meta-communication and meta-cognition; (15) provide opportunities to language practice; (16) promote learner training from problem-sensing and problem-solving; (17) promote sharing of information and expertise; (18) provide monitoring feedback of the learner and of the task; (19) ensure cost-effectiveness and a high return of investment; (20) heighten learners' consciousness of the process and encourage reflection.

There are several researchers who have conducted the study on task design. The first researcher is Armayanti Nurul Khasanah (2009). Her research entitled *How "Let's Talk" English Textbook Develops the Students' Communicative Competence*. This research paper is mainly intended to find out to what extent the tasks in "Let's Talk" English textbook develops the learners' communicative competence. This research implies that the textbook



entitled “*Let’s Talk*” is not equally distributed to develop the learners’ communicative competence. So the tasks must equally distribute to develop the learners’ communicative competence well.

The second researcher is Mayumi (Tsukuba, 2011). Her research is entitled *Analyzing Writing Tasks in Japanese High School English Textbook: English I, II, and Writing*. The result of the analysis shows that both English I and II textbooks featured mostly controlled writing tasks and fill in the blank with translation tasks, while writing textbooks included various translation and controlled writing task.

The third work is from Ardiani Sholikhah (UMS, 2013). Her research is entitled *An Analysis on Writing Task in English Textbook Entitled English in Focus for the Eight Grade of Junior High School Students*. This study is aimed in analyzing the writing tasks in the textbook entitled *English in Focus* meet the criteria of writing task suggested by Raimes, and finding whether the writing task in the textbook meet the criteria of writing task suggested by Raimes. The result shows 75% of writing tasks provided in English textbook entitled *English in Focus* are suitable with the criteria from Raimes, so that it can be concluded that the writing tasks in the textbook entitled *English in Focus for Junior High School* are categorized as good task.

The fourth researcher was conducted by Rindlowati (UMS, 2008). Her research entitled *A Descriptive Analysis on the Tasks in English Textbook for Second Year Students of Senior High School in 2006/2007 Academic Year*. Her research was aimed at describing the kinds of task, the aspect of task and to know the principle of designing task used in the English textbook entitled “Look Ahead 2” for the second year students of high school in 2006/2007 academic year. The conclusion is the tasks in the “*Look Ahead*” are categorized as good task because the tasks fulfill 37 aspects of task from 52 aspects of task in the theory.

The last work was conducted by Tini in 2010. Her work entitled “A Content Analysis On “*Let’s Talk*”: An English Textbook for The Ninth Grade of Junior High School”. The topic of her research is *content analysis of*

*textbook*. This research paper is mainly intended to find out to what extent the tasks in “*Let’s Talk*” English textbook develops the learners’ communicative competence. The result of the analysis also shows that the percentage of the types of task in CLT is 75, 02%. The conclusion is that the “let’s talk” is very good in developing communicative task. Then, the study concludes that “Let’s Talk” can be used to teach English in Junior High School.

The differences between first research and the current study are the data source and the aim of the research. The data source of the first study is a textbook entitled “Let’s Talk” while the current study use a workbook entitled “*Bahasa Inggris*”. Then, the objective of the first study is to find out whether the task develops the learners’ communicative competence (discourse competence, actional competence, social-cultural competence and strategic competence) or not, while the current study is aimed to find out whether the tasks categorized as good tasks or not based on Candlin opinion.

The differences between the second and the current study are the object, data and type of the study. The second research uses the textbook as the object while the current research uses workbook as the object. The data in the second study is only the writing tasks while in the current study, the data is all of the tasks in the workbook (writing, reading, speaking and listening task). The last difference is the type of research. The second study is quantitative comparative study while the current research is descriptive qualitative study.

The differences between the third and the current study are the object and criteria used for analyzing the tasks. The third study is about an analysis on writing tasks on a textbook, while the current study is about a tasks analysis on a workbook. The third study used the criteria of good writing task suggested by Raimes, and the current study uses the good criteria of good task suggested by Candlin.

The differences between the fourth study and the current study are the data source and the theory used. The data source is the fourth study is a textbook entitled Look Ahead 2, whilewhile the current study use a workbook entitled

“*Bahasa Inggris*”. Second, the fourth study uses 52 aspects of tasks, while the current study uses 8 criteria to analyze the task.

The differences between the last research and the current study are the data sources and the topic of the study. The data source of the fifth study is a textbook entitled “Let’s Talk” while the current study uses a workbook entitled “*Bahasa Inggris*”. Next, the topic of the fifth research is content analysis while the topic of the current study is task analysis. The position of my research is to expand the research about task analysis.

From Candlin’s suggestion about criteria of good task, the writer wants to analyze tasks in workbook entitled “*Bahasa Inggris for Ninth Grade Students of Junior High School*”. The writer takes 8 criteria from all of the criteria suggested; the criteria chosen by consider all of the task elements provided by Candlin. So, the task analysis based on the criteria that will cover all of task elements. The writer takes this workbook as the data because this book was written by the English teacher association and automatically used by all of ninth grade students in Wonogiri. So, it is very important to know how well the tasks in this workbook designed. By analyzing this book, the writer will know the quality of the tasks and the competency of English teacher in Wonogiri in designing the tasks for their students.

The writer employs descriptive analysis. The objectives of the research are to describe how the tasks provided in the book are designed to promote attention to meaning, purpose and negotiation; to describe how tasks the provided in the book are designed to draw objectives from the communicative needs of learners; to describe how the tasks provided in the book are designed to involve language use in the solving of the tasks; to describe how the tasks provided in the book are designed to provide opportunities for meta-communication and meta-cognition; to describe how the tasks provided in the book are designed to promote learner training from problem sensing and problem solving and to describe how the tasks provided in the book are designed to define a problem to work through by learner, centered on learner but guided by the teacher; to describe how tasks allow for flexible approaches

to the task, offering different routes, media, modes of participation and procedures; to describe how tasks allow different solution depending on skill and strategies drawn on by the students.

## II. Research method

In this research the writer used a descriptive qualitative research. It is a type of research method that does not include any calculation or enumerating. Qualitative research aim to gather an in-depth understanding of human behavior and the reasons that govern such behavior. The qualitative method investigates the *why* and *how* of decision making, not just *what*, *where*, *when*. The data of this research is document in the form of task script and the source is a workbook entitled “*Bahasa Inggris for Ninth Grade Students of Junior High School*” which is used in the SMP Negeri 1 Jatiroto. The workbook was written by the teacher association in Wonogiri. In collecting data, the researcher used documentation. The process of collecting document was done by reading the data. In this case the data are the tasks provided in the workbook entitled “*Bahasa Inggris for Ninth Grade Students of Junior High School*” seriously for several times. Then, the researcher identified the task based on the criteria suggested by Candlin (1987). The data in the research are analyzed by using descriptive analysis. The writer uses non-statistic analysis to analyze this data. The writer provides description of phenomena that occur naturally without the intervention of an experiment and artificially contrived treatment. The writer goes through the fifth procedures. First, reading the tasks provided in book for several times. Second, analyzing the tasks provided in book. The writer uses formula to get percentage ( $\bar{X}$ ) of the tasks which designed based on Candlin perspective:

$$\bar{X} = \frac{\text{number of criteria found in the book}}{\text{number of criteria proposed by Candlin}} \times 100 \%$$

The researcher also uses Criterion Referenced Evaluation as proposed by Nurgiyantoro (2001: 399) for counting the compatibility tasks on the workbook based on criteria of good tasks suggested by Candlin (1987) in Nunan (1988: 45), as presented here:

Interval Percentage	Quality
81%-100%	Very good
61%-80%	Good
41%-60%	Fairly good
21%-40%	Bad
0%-20%	Very bad

Third, matching the tasks provided in book with the criteria of good tasks suggested by Candlin. Third, finding the tasks provided in book that are not appropriate with the criteria of good tasks suggested by Candlin. Fourth, judging whether tasks provided in book are good or not based on criteria of good task suggested by Candlin and finally, the writer draws the conclusion.

### **III. Research Finding and Discussion**

In the research finding, the writer describes the design of task in the workbook entitled “Bahasa Inggris” used in Wonogiri regency whether it is good or not by analyzing the task based on the criteria of good task suggested by Candlin (1987) in Nunan (1988: 45-46). The writer use 8 criteria: (1) good tasks promote attention to purpose meaning and negotiation; (2) good tasks draw objective from communicative needs of the learner; (3) good tasks involve language use in solving of task; (4) good tasks provide opportunity for meta-communication and meta-cognition; (5) good tasks promote learning training trough problem solving and problem sensing; (6) good tasks define a problem trough the learner, centered on learner but guided; (7) good tasks allow for flexible approaches to the task, offering different routes, media, modes of participation and procedures; (8) good task allow different solutions depending on skills and strategies drawn on by the students.

By analyzing the task, the writer finds that the seven criteria are reflected well and one criterion is not reflected in the task on the workbook. The criterion is *the good task provides opportunity for meta-cognition*. The tasks provided in the workbook consist of many various tasks with their input and also activities. The various activities in the workbook make the learners improve their English skills. They can produce the language for communicating and interacting with other user of language. The tasks in the workbook are easy for understanding so the learners enjoy for studying English.

Based on the table in research, criteria 1 is developed by 6 models of task (word matching task involving pronunciation activity, completion task involving pronunciation activity, oral word-picture matching task, translation task involving pronunciation activity, oral production task by using picture and story telling task), criteria 2 is developed by 5 models of task (word matching task involving group work, constructing sentence task involving group work, comprehension task involving pair/group work, oral interview task and completion task involving group work), criteria 3 is developed by 3 models of task (role play task ,oral production task by using picture, constructing sentence task), criteria 4 is developed by 2 models of task (combining sentence task and completion task), criteria 5 is developed by 4 models of task (guessing task, completion task, picture-sentence matching task and sentence matching task), criteria 6 is developed by 3 models of task (reading aloud task involving comprehension in group, reading aloud task involving comprehension and practice and role play task involving comprehension in group), criteria 7 is developed by 3 models of task (dialog composition task, word-matching task and comprehension task) and the last criteria 8 is developed by 2 models of task (composition task and jumbles task).

From the research finding it can be concluded, criteria 1 consists of 11 tasks with percentage 11,45 %, criteria 2 consists of 23 tasks with percentage 23,95 %, criteria 3 consists of 8 tasks with percentage 8,33 %, criteria 4

consists of 4 task with percentage 4,16 %, criteria 5 consists of 11 task with percentage 11, 45 %, criteria 6 consists of 17 tasks with percentage 17, 70 %, criteria 7 consists of 18 criteria with percentage 18, 75 % and the last criteria 8 consists of 4 task with percentage 4, 16 %. Based on the percentage, it can be concluded that the task in the workbook mostly designed to reflect criteria number 2 that is the tasks provided to draw objective from the communicative needs of the learners. It means that the task designed to improve students L2 proficiency through interaction. The smallest percentage reflected in the criteria 4 (4, 16 %) that is the task designed to provides opportunity for meta-communication. It means that there is a little number of tasks to provide the students with opportunity to focus on language form. This result suitable with Ellis opinion that task should give primary focus on meaning while focus on form is next.

By the percentage that is shown in research finding, the result of the percentage shows that 87,5 % task in the workbook appropriate with the criteria of good task suggested by Candlin (1987) in Nunan (1988: 45-46). By using criterion of evaluation proposed by Nurgiyantoro (2001: 399), it can be concluded that the task provided in the workbook are categorized as very good task.

This research finding is in line with three researches finding before which found that the tasks provided in the book are categorized as good task. The first researcher (Rindlowati) found that the tasks in the “*Look Ahead*” are categorized as good task because the tasks fulfill 37 aspects of task from 52 aspects of task in the theory or 71, 15 % from the aspects and the second researcher (Sholikhah) found that 75% of writing tasks provided in English textbook entitled *English in Focus* are suitable with the criteria from Raimes, so that it can be concluded that the writing tasks in the textbook entitled *English in Focus for Junior High School* are categorized as good task. The result of the third study from Tini shows that the percentage of communicative task is 40, 02 %. It means that the “Let’s Talk” is average in developing communicative task. The result of the analysis also shows that the percentage

of the types of material in CLT is 75, 02%. The conclusion is that the “let’s talk” is very good in developing communicative task. Then, the study concludes that “Let’s Talk” can be used to teach English in Junior High School.

If the comparison is made, the difference of the three works is on the percentage of the criteria found in the tasks. The percentage of this research finding is higher than three works before (16, 35 % higher than Rindlowati’s finding, 12, 5 % higher than Solikhah’s finding and 12, 3 % higher than Tini’s finding).

However, the result is contradictory with two researches before. The result of the Mayumi’s analysis showed that both English I and II textbooks featured mostly controlled writing tasks but the writing task in the “*Bahasa Inggris*” featured mostly free writing tasks. The research from Nurul implies that the task in textbook entitled “*Let’s Talk*” is not good enough to develop the learners’ communicative competence but the task in the “*Bahasa Inggris*” is very good to develop learners’ communicative competence because the percentage of the communicative task in this workbook is the biggest.

#### **IV. Conclusion**

Based on the research findings, the writer concludes that: (1) the tasks designed to promote attention to purpose meaning and negotiation include word matching, completion, translation, oral production by using picture and story telling task; (2) the task designed to draw objective from communicative needs of the learners include oral interview, completion, word matching, constructing sentence and comprehension task involving pairs and groups work; (3) the task designed to involve language use in solving are include role play, oral production and constructing sentence task; (4) the task designed to provide opportunity for meta-communication include constructing sentence and completion task; (5) the task designed to promote learning training trough problem solving and problem sensing include guessing, completion, picture-sentence matching and sentence matching task; (6) the task designed to define a problem trough the learner, centered on learner but guided include reading



aloud and role play task; (7) the task designed to allow for flexible approaches to the task, offering different routes, media, modes of participation, procedures include dialog composition and word-matching task; (8) the task designed to allow different solutions depending on student' skills and strategies include composition and jumbles task; (9) by the percentage that is shown in research finding, the result of the percentage shows that 87,5 % task in the workbook appropriate with the criteria of good task suggested by Candlin (1987) in Nunan (1988: 45-46). By using criterion of evaluation proposed by Nurgiyantoro (2001: 399), it can be concluded that the task provided in the workbook are categorized as very good task.

This work found that from 8 criteria of good tasks proposed by Candlin (1987) in Nunan (1988: 45-46), one criterion is not found in the tasks on the workbook. The writer also found that sometimes the writer is missing the punctuation, grammar and also writing. These findings enlighten the researcher that designing good tasks is not an easy work. It needs principles, procedures and a theory to design good tasks.

Good task should be designed to involve speaking, writing, listening, and reading skill in the teaching and learning process. Skehan (1966) has argued that designing task involves making decision about what the learner will do, and then, the order in which they will perform these tasks. Then, there are decisions to be made regarding the specific methodological procedures for teaching each task. There are 8 procedures in designing task. In designing tasks, the writer should identify the outcomes and the indicators. Then, he or she should create a meaningful task context and identifying products and performance. The other procedure is that the designer of the task should consider the options in task design and planning task activities. Then, he or she must identify the evaluative criteria; generating an exemplary response and making decisions about scoring.

To reach a good task, Ellis (2003) states that there are eight principles that can be used as guidance for designing task. The designer of the task should ensure an appropriate level of task difficulty; establish clear goals for each

task-based lesson; and developing an appropriate orientation to performing the task in the students. Besides, he or she must ensure that students adopt an active role in task-based lesson and encourage students to take risk. Then, the designer of the task needs to ensure that the learners are primarily focused in meaning when they perform a task. The designer of task also needs to provide opportunities for focusing on form. The design of the task should require learners to evaluate their performance and progress.

Not only the designer of tasks, the editor of tasks also should have accuracy in checking the tasks that have made by the designer. Here, the editor should give the attention and check them clearly so that the tasks will be good task and complete tasks.

## V. BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Ellis, Rod. *Task-based Language Learning and Teaching*. 2003. Oxford: Oxford University Press
- Heaton, J.B. 1990. *Writing English Language Testing*. London: Longman Group
- Khasanah, Nurul Armayanti. 2009. "Let's Talk" English Textbook Develops the Students' Communicative Competence. Muhammadiyah University of Surakarta.
- Mayumi.2011. *Analyzing Writing Tasks in Japanese High School English Textbook: English I, II, and Writing*. Tsukuba.
- Nunan, David. 1988. *Syllabus Design*. Oxford: Oxford University Pres
- Nurgiyantoro, Burhan. 2001. *Penelitian dalam Pengajaran Bahasa dan Sastra*. Yogyakarta: BPPE.
- Richard, J. 1995. *Material Development in Language Teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Rindlowati, Nur. 2008. *A Descriptive Analysis on The Task in English Workbook for Second Year Students of Junior High School in 2007/2008 Academic Year*. Muhammadiyah University of Surakarta.
- Tini. 2010. *A Content Analysis on "Let's Talk": An English Textbook for the Ninth Grade of Junior High School*. Muhammadiyah University of Surakarta.
- Sholikhah, Ardiani. 2013. *Analysis on Writing Task in English Textbook Entitled English in Focus for the Eight Grades of Junior High School Students*. Muhammadiyah University of Surakarta.
- Skehan. P. 1996. *A framework from the implementation of Task-based Instruction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.